

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Laura Hansen,

Civil No. 10-3618 (SRN/JJK)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

State of Minnesota, et al.,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge Jeffrey J. Keyes dated January 27, 2011 (Doc. No. 14). Plaintiff Laura Hansen filed timely objections to the R&R. (Doc. No. 23.)

This Court has conducted a de novo review of any portion of the R&R to which Plaintiff has made specific objections. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); D. Minn. L.R. 72.02(b). Based on its review, this Court adopts the R&R.

This Court notes that Plaintiff’s objections largely suffer from the same lack of clarity and intelligibility that Magistrate Judge Keyes noted with respect to her other filings. It appears clear, however, that Plaintiff misunderstands the Court’s direction that certain of her submissions “be filed by the Clerk of Court.” Plaintiff objects to what she perceives to be the Court’s direction that the Clerk of Court, rather than Plaintiff, file the particular submissions at issue. The Court, however, is thereby simply directing the Clerk of Court to accept Plaintiff’s submissions as validly filed by Plaintiff.¹

¹ This Court further notes that Plaintiff purported to add additional defendants when filing her First Amended Complaint. On April 4, 2011, Plaintiff also filed—after Magistrate Judge Keyes issued his R&R recommending that her second and third amended complaints be
(continued...)

Based on the foregoing, and all the files, records and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge Keyes's Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 14] is **ADOPTED**;
2. Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Doc. No. 2] is **DENIED**;
3. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a second amendment complaint [Doc. No. 10] is **GRANTED**, and Plaintiff's proposed second amendment complaint [Doc. No. 11] be filed by the Clerk of Court as a "Second Amended Complaint";
4. Plaintiff's "Second Motion For Leave To Afford The 'Second Amended Complaint,' To Be Prepared And Proof Read By An Attorney Or Any Other Volunteer" [Doc. No. 13] is **GRANTED**, and the pleading attached to that motion be filed by the Clerk of Court as a "Third Amended Complaint"; and,
5. This action is **SUMMARILY DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(3)(2)(B)(ii).

Dated: May 16, 2011

s/ Susan Richard Nelson
SUSAN RICHARD NELSON
United States District Court Judge

¹(...continued)
filed—yet another complaint (Doc. No. 20), identifying two further purported defendants. Insofar as the record to date does not disclose that any of the purported defendants have been served and because this Court now orders that the entire action is dismissed, any issue of the proper defendants in this action is now moot.